arXiv:1610.06324v1 [math.AP] 20 Oct 2016

SINGULARLY PERTURBED HYPERBOLIC PROBLEMS ON METRIC GRAPHS: ASYMPTOTICS OF SOLUTIONS

YURIY GOLOVATY[1], VOLODYMYR FLYUD[1,2]

Abstract. We are interested in evolution phenomena on star-like networks composed of several branches which vary considerably in physical properties. The initial boundary value problem for singularly perturbed hyperbolic differential equation on a metric graph is studied. The hyperbolic equation becomes degenerate on a part of the graph as a small parameter goes to zero. In addition, the rates of degeneration may differ in different edges of the graph. Using the boundary layer method the complete asymptotic expansions of solutions are constructed and justified.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Statement of problem 3
3. Formal asymptotic expansion of solution: leading terms 5
3.1. Limit problem 5
3.2. Boundary layers in a vicinity of the central vertex 6
3.3. Improvement of the asymptotics near the boundary $\partial\mathcal{G}_*$ 9
3.4. Correction of approximation error in the Kirchhoff condition 9
4. Formal asymptotic expansions: general terms 10
5. Justification of the asymptotic expansions 13
5.1. Estimation of remainder terms 13
5.2. A priori estimate 14
5.3. Justification of asymptotics 15
References 16

1. Introduction

The boundary value problems for ordinary and partial differential operators on metric graphs describe a wide variety of physical processes: vibration and diffusion in networks, wave propagation in waveguide networks, expansion of signals in neurons etc. Currently, there is increasing interest in models on graphs, in particular, as a reaction to a great deal of progress in fabricating graph-like structures of the semiconductor materials, (see the survey [1] for details). The idea to investigate the quantum dynamics of particles confined to metric graphs originated with the study of free electron models of organic molecules [2–4]. Among the systems those were successfully modeled by graphs we also mention e.g., single-mode acoustic and

Key words and phrases. PDE on metric graph, hyperbolic equation, singular perturbed problem, asymptotics, boundary layer, vibration of networks.

electro-magnetic waveguide networks [5], the Anderson transition [6], fraction excitations in fractal structures [7], and mesoscopic quantum systems [8]. This resulted into the significant intensification of development of ordinary differential equations as well as PDEs on the metric graphs for the last three decades and numerous publications respectively; we refer the reader to e.g. [9–13].

It is worth pointing out that the boundary value problems for hyperbolic operators of the second order on metric graphs as well as for hyperbolic systems of conservation laws on graphs describe a diversity of physical processes. Such problems arise for example in the modelling of transversal vibrations of networks, gas transportation networks, traffic flow on road networks, supply chain management, water flow in open canals etc (see [14–16]). The d'Alembert operator $\Box = \partial_t^2 - \Delta$ and the associated Klein-Gordon operator $\Box + m^2$ on metric graphs play an important role in relativistic quantum theories [17, 18].

Recently, there has also been a growing interest in the singularly perturbed problems on metric graphs. This is partly motivated by importance of such models for many applied problems in classical and quantum mechanics, theory of non-homogeneous media, scattering theory etc. The differential equations on graphs with small or large parameters in their coefficients represent the natural models of various complicated devices with the irregular "ramified" geometry and heterogeneous properties (see e.g. [19] and [20]). Also, the asymptotic analysis of Schrödinger operators with singular perturbed potentials is one of the most natural ways to define the Hamiltonians corresponding to point interactions supported by a discrete set [21, 22] as well as the Hamiltonians on quantum graphs with point interactions at vertices [23–25].

This paper can be viewed as a natural continuation of our work [26], where the star-shaped network of strings with vanishingly small stiffness were treated. In [26], the boundary value problem for hyperbolic equation containing a small parameter multiplying the second space derivative was studied within the framework of singular perturbation theory, and asymptotics of solutions were constructed. The main objective of the present paper is to describe the vibrations of a networks with the essentially different physical properties, e.g., the stiffness coefficients of the strings have the different order of smallness as a small parameter goes to zero. We study the asymptotic behaviour of solutions to the initial boundary value problem for hyperbolic differential operator on a star-shaped metric graph with the Dirichlet type boundary conditions. In contrast to the previous paper, where the case of total degeneration of the elliptic part was treated, we consider here the partial degeneracy of a hyperbolic operator with different degeneracy factors on subgraphs. Since the coefficients of the operator depend on a small parameter in the singular way, we show that this leads to a relatively complicated behavior of solutions. We apply the boundary layer methods [27–29] in order to construct and justify the asymptotics of solutions. Note these results are readily extended to the case of more general finite graphs.

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we recall the basic notions of metric graphs and PDEs on graphs, and introduce the main object of the paper – the hyperbolic problem on a star-like graph depending on a small parameter. In Sections 3 and 4 we construct the formal asymptotic expansion of a solution for the singularly perturbed problem. Finally, in the last section we justify the asymptotics constructed above.

2. Statement of problem

A non-oriented finite graph is a pair $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, where $\mathcal{V}$ is a finite set of *vertices* and $\mathcal{E}$ is a finite set of *edges*. We consider a star-shaped planar graph $\mathcal{G}$ with n edges, i.e., $\mathcal{V} = \{a, a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ and $\mathcal{E} = \{(a, a_1), \dots, (a, a_n)\}$. The edge $e_j := (a, a_j)$ can be considered as a piece of line connecting two points a and a_j in $\mathbb{R}^2$. We will endow the graph with the metric structure. Any edge $e_j \in \mathcal{E}$ will be associated with an interval $[0, \ell_j]$ as follows. Set $\ell_j = \|a_j - a\|$, and suppose that the map $\pi_j \colon [0, \ell_j] \to e_j$ is given by

$$\pi_j(\tau) = a + \frac{\tau}{\ell_j}\,(a_j - a).$$

The map is a parametrization of e_j by the arc length parameter τ such that $\pi_j(0) = a$ and $\pi_j(\ell_j) = a_j$. Hence, there is a canonical distance function $d(x, y)$, $(x, y \in \mathcal{G})$ making the graph *a metric space* or *a metric graph*.

We call $f : \mathcal{G} \to \mathbb{R}$ the *function* on $\mathcal{G}$. Here and subsequently, f_e denotes the restriction of f to the edge e and $f_e(a)$ stands for the limit values $\lim\limits_{e \ni x \to a} f_e(x)$. The function f is *continuous* on the star-shaped metric graph $\mathcal{G}$ if it is continuous on each edge $e \in \mathcal{E}$ and at the central vertex a. The continuity f at the vertex a means that all limit values $f_e(a)$ along edges $e \in \mathcal{E}$ equal the value of f at the vertex. We also introduce the differentiation of functions along edges. Set

$$f'_e(x) = \frac{d}{d\tau}(f_e \circ \pi_e)(\tau), \tag{2.1}$$

where $x = \pi_e(\tau)$. Let $C(\mathcal{G})$ be the space of continuous functions on $\mathcal{G}$. We also define the spaces

$$\dot{C}^s(\mathcal{G}) = \{f \colon f_e \in C^s(\bar{e}) \text{ for all } e \in \mathcal{E}\},$$
$$C^s(\mathcal{G}) = \{f \colon f \in C(\mathcal{G}),\ f_e \in C^s(\bar{e}) \text{ for all } e \in \mathcal{E}\}.$$

We note that the derivatives of f at the central vertex a can not be defined; we must be content with the set of limit values $f'_e(a)$ along the edges. In other words, the first derivative f' of a $C^1(\mathcal{G})$-function f is generally discontinuous at $x = a$. Remark that the value $f'(a)$ does not matter in our considerations against the set $\{f'_e(a)\}_{e \in \mathcal{E}}$.

Let us divide the set $\mathcal{E}$ of edges into non-empty disjoint subsets $\mathcal{E}_0, \mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_k$. Thereafter the graph $\mathcal{G}$ breaks into $k+1$ star subgraphs $\mathcal{G}_0, \mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_k$, as is shown in Fig. 1. We will denote by $\partial\mathcal{G}$ the set of vertices $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$. Then $\partial\mathcal{G} = \bigcup_{i=0}^{k} \partial\mathcal{G}_i$, where $\partial\mathcal{G}_i$ is a collection of the vertices of $\mathcal{G}_i$ minus a. Set also $\mathcal{G}_* = \bigcup_{i=1}^{k} \mathcal{G}_i$. Consequently, $\mathcal{V}_* = (\partial\mathcal{G} \setminus \partial\mathcal{G}_0) \cup \{a\}$ and $\mathcal{E}_* = \mathcal{E} \setminus \mathcal{E}_0$.

We consider the function $b^\varepsilon \colon \mathcal{G} \to \mathbb{R}$ that is constant on each subgraph $\mathcal{G}_i$. Set $b^\varepsilon(x) = \varepsilon^{2m_i}$ for $x \in \mathcal{G}_i$, where $m_0 = 0$ and $m_1, \dots, m_k$ are positive integers such that $m_1 < m_2 < \dots < m_k$, and ε is a small positive parameter. The function b^ε can be considered as the stiffness coefficient of a bundle of strings, which possesses significantly different values on the subsystems $\mathcal{G}_0, \dots, \mathcal{G}_k$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. Remark that the case of rational powers $m_1, \dots, m_k$ can be reduced to the case under consideration by a suitable change of the small parameter $\varepsilon \mapsto \varepsilon^\alpha$. Let $\mathcal{I} = \mathbb{R}^+_t$ be the positive time half-line and $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{I}$.



FIGURE 1. The star graph $\mathcal{G}$ and the subgraphs $\mathcal{G}_i$.

We study the asymptotic behaviour of solution $u^\varepsilon\colon \mathcal{Q} \to \mathbb{R}$ of the boundary value problem

$$\partial_t^2 u^\varepsilon - \partial_x(b^\varepsilon \partial_x u^\varepsilon) + q u^\varepsilon = f \quad \text{in } \mathcal{Q}, \tag{2.2}$$

$$u^\varepsilon = \varphi, \quad \partial_t u^\varepsilon = \psi \quad \text{on } \mathcal{G} \times \{0\}, \tag{2.3}$$

$$u^\varepsilon = \mu \quad \text{on } \partial\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{I}, \tag{2.4}$$

$$u^\varepsilon(\,\cdot\,, t) \text{ is continuous at } x = a \text{ for all } t \in \mathcal{I}, \tag{2.5}$$

$$\sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} b_e^\varepsilon(a)\, \partial_x u_e^\varepsilon(a,t) = 0 \quad \text{for all } t \in \mathcal{I}, \tag{2.6}$$

where $f\colon \mathcal{Q} \to \mathbb{R}$, $\mu\colon \partial\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{I} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $q, \varphi, \psi\colon \mathcal{G} \to \mathbb{R}$ are given functions. By ∂_x^j we mean the operator of differentiation along the edge e as in (2.1). Since b^ε is constant on each subgraph $\mathcal{E}_i$, (2.2) is actually the set of differential equations

$$\partial_t^2 u_e^\varepsilon - \varepsilon^{2m_i} \partial_x^2 u_e^\varepsilon + q_e(x) u_e^\varepsilon = f_e(x,t) \quad \text{in } e \times \mathcal{I},$$

where $e \in \mathcal{E}_i$ and $i \in \{0, \dots, k\}$. Condition (2.6) is usually called the *Kirchhoff vertex condition.*

In order to obtain both a smooth enough solution u^ε of (2.2)–(2.6) for each positive ε and the complete asymptotic expansion of u^ε, it is necessary to put some restrictions on the input data. We suppose that

$$q \in \dot{C}^\infty(\mathcal{G}), \quad f \in \dot{C}^2(\mathcal{Q}), \quad \varphi,\, \psi \in C^2(\mathcal{G}), \quad \mu \in C^1(\partial\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{I}). \tag{2.7}$$

Moreover, the following compatibility conditions

$$\begin{aligned} &\varphi(a_j) = \mu(a_j, 0), \quad \psi(a_j) = \partial_t \mu(a_j, 0) \quad \text{for } a_j \in \partial\mathcal{G}, \\ &\sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_i} \varphi_e'(a) = 0 \quad \text{for } i \in \{0, \dots, k\} \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

hold. These conditions together with continuity of the initial data φ and ψ at $x = a$ ensure existence of a unique $C^1(\mathcal{Q})$ solution u^ε of (2.2)–(2.6) such that all its derivatives of the second order are locally bounded, and u^ε satisfies (2.2) almost everywhere in $\mathcal{Q}$ [10, 11]. Remark that all well-known results [30–34] on the unique solvability for hyperbolic initial boundary value problems are still true for the problems on metric graphs. We introduce the space

$$\mathcal{U}(\Omega) = \big\{u \in C^1(\Omega)\colon \partial_t^2 u,\ \partial_x \partial_t u,\ \partial_x^2 u \in L^\infty_{loc}(\Omega)\big\}$$

From now on, by a solution of the hyperbolic equation we mean a *weak solution* that belongs to $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{Q})$.

Remark 1. It may be mentioned here that we can make assumptions upon the input data to ensure the existence of a $C^2(\mathcal{Q})$ solution u^ε for all $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$. Namely, (2.8) must be supplemented with the following conditions

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_t^2\mu(a_j,0) - \varphi''(a_j) + q(a_j)\varphi(a_j) = f(a_j,0) && \text{for } a_j \in \partial\mathcal{G}_0,\\
&\partial_t^2\mu(a_j,0) + q(a_j)\varphi(a_j) = f(a_j,0), \quad \varphi''(a_j) = 0 && \text{for } a_j \in \partial\mathcal{G}\setminus\partial\mathcal{G}_0,\\
&\sum_{e\in\mathcal{E}_i}\psi_e'(a) = 0 \quad \text{for } i\in\{0,\dots,k\}, \qquad \varphi_e''(a) = 0 && \text{for } e\in\mathcal{E},
\end{aligned}$$

and the function $q(x)\varphi(x) - f(x,0)$ must be continuous at $x = a$. But these conditions are relatively restrictive. Therefore we assume below that only C^1 compatibility conditions (2.8) hold.

3. Formal asymptotic expansion of solution: leading terms

3.1. **Limit problem.** We look for an approximation to the solution u^ε of (2.2)–(2.6) for ε small enough, and begin by setting

$$u^\varepsilon(x,t) = u(x,t) + o(1) \quad \text{as } \varepsilon\to 0.$$

Recall that the function b^ε vanishes on the subgraph $\mathcal{G}_*$ as ε goes to zero. Upon substituting $\varepsilon = 0$ into (2.2) we see that u must satisfy the following equations

$$\partial_t^2 u - \partial_x^2 u + qu = f \quad \text{in } \mathcal{Q}_0, \qquad \partial_t^2 u + qu = f \quad \text{in } \mathcal{Q}_*,$$

where $\mathcal{Q}_0 = \mathcal{G}_0\times\mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{Q}_* = \mathcal{G}_*\times\mathcal{I}$. In addition, our sending $\varepsilon\to 0$ in (2.6) yields the condition

$$\sum_{e\in\mathcal{E}_0}\partial_x u_e = 0 \quad \text{on } \{a\}\times\mathcal{I}.$$

Thus on the subgraph $\mathcal{G}_*$ the hyperbolic equation (2.2) degenerates into the ordinary differential equation with respect to t, depending on parameter x. Therefore u can not satisfy all of the boundary conditions (2.4)–(2.6). It is reasonable to consider the problem

$$\partial_t^2 u - \partial_x^2 u + qu = f \quad \text{in } \mathcal{Q}_0, \tag{3.1}$$

$$\partial_t^2 u + qu = f \quad \text{in } \mathcal{Q}_*, \tag{3.2}$$

$$u = \varphi, \quad \partial_t u = \psi \quad \text{on } \mathcal{G}\times\{0\}, \qquad u = \mu \quad \text{on } \partial\mathcal{G}_0\times\mathcal{I}, \tag{3.3}$$

$$\text{the restriction of } u(\,\cdot\,,t) \text{ to } \mathcal{G}_0 \text{ is continuous at } a \text{ for all } t\in\mathcal{I}, \tag{3.4}$$

$$\sum_{e\in\mathcal{E}_0}\partial_x u_e = 0 \quad \text{on } \{a\}\times\mathcal{I}, \tag{3.5}$$

which is actually an uncoupled system of the initial boundary value problem for the hyperbolic equation on the graph $\mathcal{G}_0$ and ordinary differential equations on edges of $\mathcal{G}_*$.

Lemma 3.1. *Under assumption* (2.7), (2.8) *there exists a unique weak solution of* (3.1)–(3.5).

Proof. First, the restriction u to $\mathcal{Q}_0$ solves the hyperbolic boundary value problem on $\mathcal{G}_0$:

$$\partial_t^2 u - \partial_x^2 u + qu = f \qquad \text{in } \mathcal{Q}_0, \tag{3.6}$$

$$u = \varphi, \quad \partial_t u = \psi \ \text{ on } \mathcal{G}_0 \times \{0\}, \quad u = \mu \ \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{G}_0 \times \mathcal{I}, \tag{3.7}$$

$$u(\,\cdot\,, t) \text{ is continuous at } x = a \text{ for all } t \in \mathcal{I}, \tag{3.8}$$

$$\sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_0} \partial_x u_e = 0 \quad \text{on } \{a\} \times \mathcal{I}. \tag{3.9}$$

The problem admits a unique weak solution, because the input data are smooth enough and the C^1 compatibility conditions

$$\varphi(a_j) = \mu(a_j, 0), \quad \psi(a_j) = \partial_t \mu(a_j, 0) \ \text{ for } a_j \in \partial\mathcal{G}_0, \quad \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_0} \varphi_e'(a) = 0 \tag{3.10}$$

hold, which follows from (2.7) and (2.8).

Next, we can find u on the rest of edges by solving the Cauchy problems for ordinary differential equations with respect to time

$$\partial_t^2 u + qu = f \quad \text{in } e \times \mathcal{I}, \qquad u = \varphi, \quad \partial_t u = \psi \quad \text{on } e \times \{0\} \tag{3.11}$$

for each $e \in \mathcal{E}_*$ separately. All these problems can be solved explicitly:

$$\begin{aligned} u(x,t) = \varphi(x) \cos \sqrt{q(x)}\, t + \frac{\psi(x)}{\sqrt{q(x)}} \sin \sqrt{q(x)}\, t \\ + \frac{1}{\sqrt{q(x)}} \int_0^t f(x,\tau) \sin \sqrt{q(x)}(t-\tau)\, d\tau, \quad \text{if } q(x) \neq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

$$u(x,t) = \varphi(x) + t\psi(x) + \int_0^t (t-\tau) f(x,\tau)\, d\tau, \quad \text{if } q(x) = 0 \tag{3.13}$$

for all $x \in \mathcal{G}_*$ and $t \in \mathcal{I}$. Here we choose the single-valued branch of the root $w = \sqrt{z}$ such that $w(1) = 1$. It is easy to check that the solution u given by (3.12) and (3.13) is a twice continuously differentiable real-valued function in $\mathcal{Q}_*$, since the functions q, f, φ and ψ are smooth enough by (2.7). □

From now on, U_0 stands for the solution of (3.6)–(3.9) and u_0 for the solution of (3.11). Thus

$$u(x,t) = \begin{cases} U_0(x,t) & \text{if } (x,t) \in \mathcal{Q}_0, \\ u_0(x,t) & \text{if } (x,t) \in \mathcal{Q}_*. \end{cases} \tag{3.14}$$

Because we can not control in time the value of u_0 both at the central vertex a and on the boundary of graph $\mathcal{G}_*$, the approximation (3.14) generally ignores continuity condition (2.5) as well as boundary conditions (2.4) on $\partial\mathcal{G}_*$. This approximation is therefore not suitable for the whole graph $\mathcal{G}$. We shall refine (3.14) by applying boundary layer approximations.

3.2. **Boundary layers in a vicinity of the central vertex.** First we modify the approximation (3.14) in the area of degeneration of the hyperbolic equation in order to satisfy the continuity condition (2.5).

Given a subgraph $\mathcal{G}_i$, we introduce the new variables $y = \varepsilon^{-m_i}(x - a)$. In the auxiliary space $\mathbb{R}^2_y$ we consider the star graph $\mathcal{G}_i^\varepsilon$, which is the image of $\mathcal{G}_i$ under the expanding mapping $x \mapsto y$. For all positive ε this image lies on the noncompact star



FIGURE 2. The graphs $\mathcal{G}_i^\varepsilon$ and $\mathcal{G}_i^\infty$.

graph $\mathcal{G}_i^\infty = (\{O\}, \mathcal{E}_i^\infty)$, as shown in Fig. 2. Here O is the origin of $\mathbb{R}^2_y$ and $\mathcal{E}_i^\infty$ is the set of edge-rays e_j^∞ of $\mathcal{G}_i^\infty$. All such edges e_j^∞ possess the natural parametrisation

$$\pi_j^\infty \colon [0, +\infty) \to e_j^\infty, \qquad \pi_j^\infty(\tau) = \frac{a_j - a}{\|a_j - a\|}\,\tau.$$

Since $\partial_y = \varepsilon^{m_i}\partial_x$, in terms of the new variables the homogeneous PDE (2.2) on $\mathcal{G}_i$ can be written as

$$\partial_t^2 v^\varepsilon - \partial_y^2 v^\varepsilon + q(a + \varepsilon^{m_i} y) v^\varepsilon = 0 \qquad \text{in } \mathcal{G}_i^\varepsilon \times \mathcal{I}. \tag{3.15}$$

The coefficient b^ε in (2.2) is infinitely small on $\mathcal{G}_*$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$, therefore we can use b^ε as a "small parameter" in this subgraph. Let us introduce the new fast variables $y_\varepsilon = (x - a)/\sqrt{b^\varepsilon(x)}$ on $\mathcal{G}_*$ and modify our approximation

$$u^\varepsilon(x,t) \approx \begin{cases} U_0(x,t) & \text{if } (x,t) \in \mathcal{Q}_0, \\ u_0(x,t) + v_0(y_\varepsilon, t) & \text{if } (x,t) \in \mathcal{Q}_*. \end{cases} \tag{3.16}$$

We define the function v_0 as follows. Fix a number $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ and an edge $e \in \mathcal{E}_i$, and let e^∞ be the corresponding edge-ray of $\mathcal{E}_i^\infty$ in the plane $\mathbb{R}^2_y$ with the coordinates $y = \varepsilon^{-m_i}(x - a)$ (see Fig. 2). In view of (3.15) and the formal Taylor expansion

$$q_e(a + \varepsilon^{m_i} y) = q_e(a) + \varepsilon^{m_i} q_e'(a) y + \tfrac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{2m_i} q_e''(a) y^2 + \cdots, \tag{3.17}$$

we assume that the restriction of v_0 to the edge e^∞ solves the initial boundary value problem

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t^2 v - \partial_y^2 v + q_e(a) v = 0 && \text{in } e^\infty \times \mathcal{I}, \\ &v = 0, \quad \partial_t v = 0 && \text{on } e^\infty \times \{0\}, \\ &v = U_0(a, \cdot) - u_{0e}(a, \cdot) && \text{on } \{O\} \times \mathcal{I}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

The value $U_0(a,t)$ is properly defined, since U_0 is continuous at the vertex a. Hence, the approximation (3.16) satisfies (2.5), since $u_{0e}(a,t) + v_{0e}(O,t) = U_0(a,t)$ for all $e \in \mathcal{E}_*$ and $t \in \mathcal{I}$. Note that the initial data of (3.18) satisfy the compatibility

conditions:

$$\lim_{t\to 0} v(O,t) = U_0(a,0) - u_{0e}(a,0) = \varphi(a) - \varphi(a) = 0,$$
$$\lim_{t\to 0} \partial_t v(O,t) = \partial_t U_0(a,0) - \partial_t u_{0e}(a,0) = \psi(a) - \psi(a) = 0,$$

which follows from (3.7), (3.11) and continuity of φ and ψ.

Lemma 3.2. *Let v_0 be a solution of (3.18). Given $T > 0$, the composition*

$$V_\varepsilon(x,t) = v_0\left(\frac{x-a}{\sqrt{b^\varepsilon(x)}}, t\right)$$

represents a boundary layer function near the central vertex as $\varepsilon \to 0$, i.e., V_ε is different from zero in the $\sqrt{b^\varepsilon}\,t$-neighbourhood of the vertex a only.

Proof. Problem (3.18) is a standard initial boundary value problem for hyperbolic equation in a quarter-plane of the form

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t^2 v - \partial_s^2 v - \vartheta v = 0 && \text{in } \{(s,t)\in\mathbb{R}^2 \colon s>0,\, t>0\},\\ &v(s,0) = \alpha(s), \quad \partial_t v(s,0) = \beta(s) && \text{for } s>0,\\ &v(0,t) = \nu(t) && \text{for } t>0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

It admits a unique solution, provided the C^1 compatibility conditions

$$\nu(0) = \alpha(0), \qquad \nu'(0) = \beta(0) \tag{3.20}$$

hold. Under the characteristic $s - t = 0$ passing through the origin the solution is given by

$$v(s,t) = \frac{1}{2}\left(\alpha(s+t) + \alpha(s-t)\right) + \frac{1}{2}\int_{s-t}^{s+t} \left(k(t,s,\xi)\beta(\xi) + \partial_t k(t,s,\xi)\alpha(\xi)\right) d\xi, \tag{3.21}$$

where $k(t,s,\xi) = J_0\left(\sqrt{\vartheta\big((s-\xi)^2 - t^2\big)}\right)$ and J_0 is the Bessel function (see [35, Ch.2]). The last formula is valid for all real ϑ, in particular, for $\vartheta = 0$ it turns into d'Alembert's formula.

Therefore for any point (s_0,t_0) such that $s_0 > t_0 > 0$ the value of $v(s_0,t_0)$ depends on the initial data α and β in the interval $[s_0 - t_0, s_0 + t_0]$ only. From this we deduce that a solution v_0 of (3.18) is equal to zero for $y > t > 0$, since



FIGURE 3. The boundary layers near the vertices a and a_j on the edge e_j of subgraph $\mathcal{G}_*$.

this solution satisfies the homogeneous initial conditions. Hence, V_ε is also equal to zero for $x-a>\sqrt{b^\varepsilon}\,t$, i.e., V_ε possesses non-zero values in the $\sqrt{b^\varepsilon}\,t$-neighbourhood of the vertex a only (see the first plot in Fig. 3). This region is small as $\varepsilon\to 0$ uniformly on $t\in(0,T)$. □

3.3. **Improvement of the asymptotics near the boundary $\partial\mathcal{G}_*$.** We now modify asymptotics (3.16) near the boundary vertices $a_j\in\partial\mathcal{G}_*$, in the same way as we did it near the central vertex a. Let e be the edge of subgraph $\mathcal{G}_i$ connecting the vertices a and a_j. We introduce the new variables

$$z=\varepsilon^{-m_i}(x-a_j)\quad\text{for } x\in e.$$

Suppose that the function $w_{0,e}$ solves the initial boundary value problem in the quarter-plane

$$\begin{aligned}&\partial_t^2 w-\partial_z^2 w+q_e(a_j)w=0 && \text{in } \{(z,t)\colon z<0,\ t>0\},\\ &w(z,0)=0,\quad \partial_t w(z,0)=0 && \text{for } z<0,\\ &w(0,t)=\mu_e(t)-u_{0e}(a_j,t) && \text{for } t>0.\end{aligned}\tag{3.22}$$

In view of (2.8) and (3.11), the C^1 compatibility conditions for the problem hold. As in the earlier proof of Lemma 3.2, one likewise deduces that $w_{0,e}$ is nonzero above the characteristic $z+t=0$ only.

We define $w_0^\varepsilon\colon\mathcal{Q}_*\to\mathbb{R}$ as follows. For any $e_j=(a,a_j)$ such that $e_j\in\mathcal{E}_i$, $i=1,\dots,k$, the restriction of w_0^ε to the set $e_j\times\mathcal{I}$ coincides with the function

$$w_{0,e_j}\left(\varepsilon^{-m_i}(x-a_j),t\right).$$

Hence, w_0^ε is a boundary layer function, which describes the singular behaviour of u^ε in a neighbourhood of boundary $\partial\mathcal{G}_*$. Note the boundary conditions at $z=0$ have been chosen in the manner that $u_0+w_0^\varepsilon$ satisfies (2.4).

We will from now on assume that the time variable t belongs to a finite interval $(0,T)$, and introduce the notation $\mathcal{I}_T=(0,T)$, $\mathcal{Q}_T=\mathcal{G}\times\mathcal{I}_T$, $\mathcal{Q}_0^T=\mathcal{G}_0\times\mathcal{I}_T$, and $\mathcal{Q}_*^T=\mathcal{G}_*\times\mathcal{I}_T$. Then if ε is small enough and $t\in(0,T)$, the functions $v_0(y_\varepsilon,\cdot\,)$ and w_0^ε are actually boundary layers localized near the vertex of $\mathcal{G}_*$ (see the second plot in Fig. 3). Hence, we set

$$u^\varepsilon(x,t)\approx\begin{cases}U_0(x,t) & \text{if } (x,t)\in\mathcal{Q}_0^T,\\ u_0(x,t)+v_0(y_\varepsilon,t)+w_0^\varepsilon(x,t) & \text{if } (x,t)\in\mathcal{Q}_*^T.\end{cases}\tag{3.23}$$

We will refer to (3.23) as the leading behavior or leading terms of the asymptotics. At this point, this approximation produces the largest error of order ε^{m_1} in the Kirchhoff condition (2.6). We end the section by construction of the first correctors on $\mathcal{G}_0$, although we already solved the task declared in the title of this section. The problems for these correctors are slightly different from the problem for U_0.

3.4. **Correction of approximation error in the Kirchhoff condition.** To improve the accuracy of the approximation in the Kirchhoff condition (2.6), we finally add new terms to the approximation on $\mathcal{G}_0$:

$$u^\varepsilon(x,t)\sim\begin{cases}U_0(x,t)+\displaystyle\sum_{i=1}^k\varepsilon^{m_i}U_1^{(i)}(x,t) & \text{if } (x,t)\in\mathcal{Q}_0^T,\\ u_0(x,t)+v_0(y_\varepsilon,t)+w_0^\varepsilon(x,t) & \text{if } (x,t)\in\mathcal{Q}_*^T.\end{cases}\tag{3.24}$$

Our substituting (3.24) into (2.6) yields

$$\sum_{e\in\mathcal{E}_0}\partial_x U_{0e}(a,t)+\sum_{i=1}^{k}\varepsilon^{m_i}\sum_{e\in\mathcal{E}_0}\partial_x U^{(i)}_{1e}(a,t)$$
$$+\sum_{i=1}^{k}\varepsilon^{m_i}\sum_{\gamma\in\mathcal{E}_i^\infty}\partial_y v_{0\gamma}(O,\cdot)+\sum_{i=1}^{k}\varepsilon^{2m_i}\sum_{\gamma\in\mathcal{E}_i}\partial_x u_{0e}(a,t)\sim 0. \quad (3.25)$$

The function w_0^ε is absent in the last formula, because it vanishes in a neighbourhood of the vertex a. The first sum in (3.25) is zero due to (3.9). The next two double sums have to eliminate each other. Therefore the function $U_1^{(i)}$ must be a solution to the problem

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_t^2 U-\partial_x^2 U+qU=0 \qquad \text{in } \mathcal{Q}_0,\\
&U=0,\quad \partial_t U=0 \ \text{ on } \mathcal{G}_0\times\{0\},\quad U=0 \ \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{G}_0\times\mathcal{I},\\
&U(\,\cdot\,,t) \text{ is continuous at } a \text{ for all } t\in\mathcal{I},\\
&\sum_{e\in\mathcal{E}_0}\partial_x U_e(a,\cdot)=-\sum_{\gamma\in\mathcal{E}_i^\infty}\partial_y v_{0\gamma}(O,\cdot) \quad \text{on } \mathcal{I},
\end{aligned} \quad (3.26)$$

where $i\in\{1,\dots,k\}$. The problem is a partial case of the hyperbolic boundary value problem on $\mathcal{G}_0$ with the nonhomogeneous Kirchhoff condition:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_t^2 u-\partial_x^2 u+qu=0 \ \text{ in } \mathcal{Q}_0,\\
&u=\varphi,\ \partial_t u=\psi \ \text{ on } \mathcal{G}_0\times\{0\},\quad u=\mu \ \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{G}_0\times\mathcal{I},\\
&u(\,\cdot\,,t) \text{ is continuous at } a \text{ for } t\in\mathcal{I},\quad \sum_{e\in\mathcal{E}_0}\partial_x u_e=\nu \ \text{ for } \{a\}\times\mathcal{I}.
\end{aligned} \quad (3.27)$$

It is reasonably easy to see that the C^1 compatibility conditions for the problem have the form:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varphi(a_i)=\mu(a_i,0),\quad \psi(a_i)=\partial_t\mu(a_i,0) \quad \text{for } a_i\in\partial\mathcal{G}_0,\\
&\varphi,\psi \text{ are continuous at } x=a,\quad \sum_{e\in\mathcal{E}_0}\varphi_e'(a)=\nu(0),
\end{aligned} \quad (3.28)$$

provided ν is a continuous function on $\mathcal{I}$. And indeed these conditions hold for (3.26), since $v_{0\gamma}(y,0)=0$ for all $\gamma\in\mathcal{E}_i^\infty$. Problem (3.27) admits a unique solution $u\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{Q}_0)$ [26], see also the proof of Lemma 5.1.

By construction, approximation (3.24) satisfies conditions (2.3)-(2.5) exactly and (2.6) up to terms of order ε^{2m_1}. Besides, v_0 and w_0^ε cause small errors in the right hand side of (2.2) those are localized in the boundary layer regions.

4. Formal asymptotic expansions: general terms

Our work in the previous section leads us to conclusion that the complete asymptotic expansion of u^ε can be found in the form

$$u^\varepsilon(x,t)\sim U_0(x,t)+\sum_{s=1}^{\infty}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\varepsilon^{sm_i}U_s^{(i)}(x,t) \qquad \text{if } (x,t)\in\mathcal{Q}_0^T, \quad (4.1)$$

$$u^\varepsilon(x,t)\sim\sum_{s=0}^{\infty}\{b^\varepsilon(x)\}^{\frac{s}{2}}\big(u_s(x,t)+v_s(y_\varepsilon,t)+w_s^\varepsilon(x,t)\big) \qquad \text{if } (x,t)\in\mathcal{Q}_*^T. \quad (4.2)$$

We also assume that all v_s and w_s^ε are functions of boundary layer type, i.e., for small ε the functions $v_s(y_\varepsilon, t)$ are different from zero in a small neighbourhood of the central vertex and w_s^ε can possess non-zero values in a vicinity of the boundary $\partial\mathcal{G}_*$ only. The validity of these assumptions will be considered further when we will construct the asymptotics. Recall that $\{b^\varepsilon(x)\}^{\frac{s}{2}} = \varepsilon^{sm_i}$ for $x \in \mathcal{G}_i$.

This may happen that some terms in (4.1) as well as in (3.25) have the same order of smallness. This is because there are equal numbers among the integers sm_i. Let us introduce the sets $\Lambda(p) = \{(n,i) \in \mathbb{N}\times\{1,\dots,k\}\colon nm_i = p\}$ for each natural p. Of course, some of them are empty. All sets $\Lambda(p)$ are finite, therefore the terms of the same order in (4.1) can be aggregated in the final form of approximation:

$$\sum_{s=1}^{\infty}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\varepsilon^{sm_i}U_s^{(i)} = \sum_{p=1}^{\infty}\varepsilon^p \sum_{(s,i)\in\Lambda(p)} U_s^{(i)}$$

Substituting (4.1) and (4.2) into (2.2)–(2.6) and collecting powers of ε gives a sequence of problems for the terms of series. First, the functions $U_s^{(i)}$ are solutions to the problems

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_t^2 U_s^{(i)} - \partial_x^2 U_s^{(i)} + qU_s^{(i)} = 0 \qquad \text{in } \mathcal{Q}_0,\\
&U_s^{(i)} = 0, \quad \partial_t U_s^{(i)} = 0 \ \text{ on } \mathcal{G}_0\times\{0\}, \quad U_s^{(i)} = 0 \ \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{G}_0\times\mathcal{I},\\
&U_s^{(i)}(\,\cdot\,,t) \text{ is continuous at } a \text{ for all } t\in\mathcal{I},\\
&\sum_{e\in\mathcal{E}_0}\partial_x U_{s,e}^{(i)} = -\sum_{e\in\mathcal{E}_i}\partial_x u_{s-2,e} - \sum_{\gamma\in\mathcal{E}_i^\infty}\partial_y v_{s-1,\gamma}(O,\cdot) \ \text{ on } \{a\}\times\mathcal{I}
\end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

for $s \ge 2$ and $i \in \{1,\dots,k\}$. In our approximation the terms $U_s^{(i)}$ reduce errors in the Kirchhoff condition (2.6), but without modification of continuity condition (2.5) as well as the initial and boundary value conditions (2.3), (2.4). Recall that each subgraph $\mathcal{G}_i = \{\mathcal{V}_i, \mathcal{E}_i\}$ is associated with the non-compact graph $\mathcal{G}_i^\infty = \{\mathcal{V}_i^\infty, \mathcal{E}_i^\infty\}$, obtained by the dilatation $y = \varepsilon^{-m_i}(x-a)$ as $\varepsilon\to 0$. The point O is the origin of plane $\mathbb{R}^2_y$.

The functions u_s are terms of the regular asymptotics on subgraphs $\mathcal{G}_1,\dots,\mathcal{G}_k$. Since the hyperbolic equation (2.2) becomes degenerate for $\varepsilon = 0$, we can find u_s on each edge $e \in \mathcal{E}_*$ by solving the Cauchy problems for ordinary differential equations with respect to time

$$\partial_t^2 u_s + qu_s = \partial_x^2 u_{s-2} \ \text{ in } e\times\mathcal{I}, \qquad u_s = 0, \quad \partial_t u_s = 0 \ \text{ on } e\times\{0\}, \tag{4.4}$$

where $s \ge 1$. The task of u_s is to exhaust the residual in the right-hand side of equation (2.2) on more flexible graphs $\mathcal{G}_i$, $i \ge 1$.

Remark 2. Equation (4.4) is homogeneous for $s = 1$. Then $u_1 = 0$ by uniqueness, and recursive calculations yield $u_3 = 0, u_5 = 0, \dots$. Hence all $u_s = 0$ with the odd index s are zero functions.

Next, the continuity condition (2.5) can be satisfied asymptotically by means of the boundary layer functions $v_s = v_s(y_\varepsilon, t)$ those are localized about the central vertex. Given $i \in \{1,2,\dots,k\}$ and an edge $e \in \mathcal{E}_i$, we consider the corresponding edge-ray γ of $\mathcal{G}_i^\infty$ in the plane $\mathbb{R}^2_y$ and define the restriction of v_s to $\gamma\times\mathcal{I}$ as a

solution of the problem

$$\partial_t^2 v_s - \partial_y^2 v_s + q_\gamma(a) v_s = -\sum_{r=1}^{s} \tfrac{1}{r!}\, q_\gamma^{(r)}(a)\, y^r\, v_{s-r,\gamma} \quad \text{in } \gamma \times \mathcal{I}, \tag{4.5}$$

$$v_s = 0, \quad \partial_t v_s = 0 \ \text{ on } \gamma \times \{0\}, \tag{4.6}$$

$$v_s = \sum_{(r,l)\in\Lambda(sm_i)} U_r^{(l)}(a,\cdot) - u_{s,e}(a,\cdot) \ \text{ on } \{O\} \times \mathcal{I}. \tag{4.7}$$

Finally, for all $s \in \mathbb{N}$ we define the map $w_s^\varepsilon \colon \mathcal{Q}_* \to \mathbb{R}$ that is a collection of boundary layers on each edge $e \in \mathcal{E}_*$. These boundary layers are localized near the boundary $\partial\mathcal{G}_*$ and reduce the approximation error in boundary condition (2.4). For any $i = 1, \dots, k$ and $e \in \mathcal{E}_i$, the restriction of w_s^ε to e is given by

$$w_{s,e}^\varepsilon(x,t) = w_{s,e}\left(\varepsilon^{-m_i}(x - a_j), t\right),$$

where $w_{s,e}$ solves the problem

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t^2 w_{s,e} - \partial_z^2 w_{s,e} + q_e(a_j) w_{s,e} = -\sum_{r=1}^{s} \tfrac{1}{r!} q_e^{(r)}(a_j)\, z^r\, w_{s-r,e} \ \text{ in } P, \\ &w_{s,e}(z,0) = 0, \quad \partial_t w_{s,e}(z,0) = 0 \quad \text{for } z < 0, \\ &w_{s,e}(0,t) = -u_{s,e}(a_j,t) \quad \text{for } t > 0. \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

Here P is the quarter-plane $\{(z,t)\colon z < 0,\, t > 0\}$ and $z = \varepsilon^{-m_i}(x - a_j)$ is a new fast variable on the edge e.

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose that the initial data of problem (2.2)–(2.6) satisfy conditions (2.7) and (2.8). Then the coefficients $U_s^{(i)}$, u_s, v_s and w_s^ε of formal series (4.1), (4.2) are unique and can be determined recursively up to arbitrary order s in the class of continuously differentiable functions those possess locally bounded derivatives of the second order. Furthermore, for ε small enough and $t \in (0,T)$ the functions $v_s(y_\varepsilon, \cdot)$ and w_s^ε are boundary layer corrections those are localized about the central vertex a and the boundary $\partial\mathcal{G}_*$ respectively.*

Proof. The proof is by induction on s. Assume that we have already found the terms $U_r^{(i)}$, u_r, v_r and w_r^ε for $r < s$ with desired smoothness, where $v_r(y_\varepsilon, \cdot)$ and w_r^ε are functions of boundary layer type as $\varepsilon \to 0$. In order to show that the s-th step in the recursive process is solvable, we must analyze solvability of problems (4.3)–(4.8) in appropriate spaces.

We start with problem (4.4) which admits the explicit solution: $u_s(x,t) = 0$ for odd s, and

$$u_s(x,t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{q(x)}} \int_0^t \partial_x^2 u_{s-2}(x,\tau) \sin\sqrt{q(x)}(t-\tau)\, d\tau, \qquad \text{if } q(x) \neq 0, \tag{4.9}$$

$$u_s(x,t) = \int_0^t (t-\tau)\partial_x^2 u_{s-2}(x,\tau)\, d\tau, \qquad \text{if } q(x) = 0 \tag{4.10}$$

for even s and $(x,t) \in \mathcal{Q}_*$. Since $q \in \dot{C}^\infty(\mathcal{G})$ and $f \in \dot{C}^2(\mathcal{Q})$, solution u_0 of (3.11) is twice continuously differentiable function. Hence, all u_s are also C^2-functions due to the recursive procedure.

Hyperbolic problem (4.3) on graph $\mathcal{G}_0$ contains the non-homogeneous Kirchhoff condition, where the right hand side is known by induction hypothesis. The problem

admits a unique solution $U_s^{(i)} \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{Q}_0)$, provided the C^1 compatibility conditions (3.28) hold. In this case, the conditions take the form

$$\sum_{e\in\mathcal{E}_i} \partial_x u_{s-2,e}(a,0) + \sum_{\gamma\in\mathcal{E}_i^\infty} \partial_y v_{s-1,\gamma}(O,0) = 0,$$

but the last equality is true, because the terms u_{s-2} and v_{s-1} satisfy the homogeneous initial conditions at $t=0$ by (4.4) and (4.6).

As for problem (4.5)–(4.7), we first of all note that all right hand sides are already defined. The problem is the classic mixed problem for hyperbolic equation on the half-line [31,32]. There exists a unique solution $v_{s,\gamma} \in \mathcal{U}(\gamma\times\mathcal{I})$ for any edge $\gamma \in \mathcal{E}_i^\infty$ and $i \in \{1,\dots,k\}$ if the compatibility condition (3.20) hold, i.e.,

$$\sum_{(r,l)\in\Lambda(sm_i)} U_r^{(l)}(a,0) = u_{s,e}(a,0), \qquad \sum_{(r,l)\in\Lambda(sm_i)} \partial_t U_r^{(l)}(a,0) = \partial_t u_{s,e}(a,0).$$

Both equalities are true, since $U_r^{(l)}$ and $u_{s,e}$ satisfy homogeneous initial conditions at $t=0$ as solutions of (4.3) and (4.4) respectively. Next, the right hand side of (4.5) is identically zero under the characteristic $s-t=0$, by induction. Taking into account the homogeneous initial conditions (4.6) and integral representation (3.21) we conclude that $v_{s,\gamma}$ is equal to zero for $s>t>0$.

The similar considerations can be also apply to problem (4.8) on the half-line, for which there exists a unique solution $w_{s,e} \in \mathcal{U}(P)$. □

5. Justification of the asymptotic expansions

In this section we will prove that formal series (4.1), (4.2) actually solve the singularly perturbed problem (2.2)–(2.6) in the sense of asymptotic approximation.

5.1. **Estimation of remainder terms.** We introduce the partial sums of (4.1), (4.2)

$$u^{\varepsilon,p}(x,t) = \begin{cases} U_0(x,t) + \sum\limits_{s=1}^{p}\sum\limits_{i=1}^{k} \varepsilon^{sm_i} U_s^{(i)}(x,t) & \text{if } (x,t)\in\mathcal{Q}_0^T, \\ \sum\limits_{s=0}^{p} \{b^\varepsilon(x)\}^{\frac{s}{2}} \big(u_s(x,t) + v_s(y_\varepsilon,t) + w_s^\varepsilon(x,t)\big) & \text{if } (x,t)\in\mathcal{Q}_*^T \end{cases} \tag{5.1}$$

with all coefficients constructed in Sections 3 and 4. Substituting $u^{\varepsilon,p}$ into singularly perturbed problem (2.2)–(2.6), we can estimate the remainder terms in the equation and all conditions. A somewhat lengthy, but not complicated, computation shows that $u^{\varepsilon,p}$ is a solution of the problem

$$\partial_t^2 u^{\varepsilon,p} - \partial_x(b^\varepsilon \partial_x u^{\varepsilon,p}) + q u^{\varepsilon,p} = f + h^{\varepsilon,p} \quad \text{in } \mathcal{Q}_T, \tag{5.2}$$

$$u^{\varepsilon,p} = \varphi, \quad \partial_t u^{\varepsilon,p} = \psi \quad \text{on } \mathcal{G}\times\{0\}, \tag{5.3}$$

$$u^{\varepsilon,p} = \mu \quad \text{on } \partial\mathcal{G}\times\mathcal{I}_T, \tag{5.4}$$

$$u^{\varepsilon,p}(\,\cdot\,,t) \text{ is continuous at } x=a \text{ for all } t\in\mathcal{I}_T, \tag{5.5}$$

$$\sum_{e\in\mathcal{E}} b_e^\varepsilon(a)\,\partial_x u_e^{\varepsilon,p}(a,t) = \nu^{\varepsilon,p}(t) \quad \text{for all } t\in\mathcal{I}_T. \tag{5.6}$$

By construction the function $u^{\varepsilon,p}$ precisely satisfies the initial and boundary value conditions (5.3), (5.4) as well as the continuity condition (5.6). The term $h^{\varepsilon,p}$ in

right-hand side of (5.2) is different from zero in neighbourhood of the central vertex a and the boundary $\partial\mathcal{G}_*$ only. Moreover, there exists a constant $c_1(T)$ such that

$$|h^{\varepsilon,p}(x,t)| \le c_1(T)\varepsilon^{(p+1)m_1} \quad \text{for all } (x,t) \in \mathcal{Q}_T. \tag{5.7}$$

The remainder $\nu^{\varepsilon,p}$ in the Kirchhoff condition (5.6) is a continuous function and

$$|\nu^{\varepsilon,p}(t)| \le c_2(T)\varepsilon^{(p+1)m_1} \quad \text{for } t \in \mathcal{I}_T. \tag{5.8}$$

Recall that m_1 is the smallest number in the set $\{m_1,\dots,m_k\}$. In order to prove that the smallness of remainders $h^{\varepsilon,p}$ and $\nu^{\varepsilon,p}$ implies the asymptotic smallness of the difference between the exact solution u^ε of (2.2)–(2.6) and the approximation $u^{\varepsilon,p}$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$ we need some estimates for solutions of hyperbolic problems on graphs.

5.2. **A priori estimate.** Let us consider the initial boundary value problem on graph $\mathcal{G}$

$$\partial_t^2 u - \partial_x(b(x)\partial_x u) + q(x)u = f(x,t) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{Q}_T, \tag{5.9}$$

$$u = \varphi, \quad \partial_t u = \psi \quad \text{on } \mathcal{G}\times\{0\}, \tag{5.10}$$

$$u = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\mathcal{G}\times\mathcal{I}_T, \tag{5.11}$$

$$u(\,\cdot\,,t) \text{ is continuous at } x = a \text{ for all } t \in \mathcal{I}_T, \tag{5.12}$$

$$\sum_{e\in\mathcal{E}} b_e(a)\,\partial_x u_e(a,t) = \nu(t) \quad \text{for all } t \in \mathcal{I}_T. \tag{5.13}$$

Throughout the section, $W_2^l(\Omega)$, $l = 0,1,\dots$, stands for the Sobolev space of functions defined on a set Ω those belong to $L^2(\Omega)$ together with their derivatives up to order l.

Lemma 5.1 (A priori estimate)**.** *Assume that the input data of* (5.9)–(5.13) *satisfy conditions* (2.7), (3.28) *and the coefficient b is constant on each edge $e \in \mathcal{E}$. If u is a solution of* (5.9)–(5.13)*, then*

$$\|u\|_{W_2^2(\mathcal{Q}_T)} \le C(T)\left(\|\varphi\|_{W_2^1(\mathcal{G})} + \|\psi\|_{L_2(\mathcal{G})} + \|\nu\|_{L_2(\mathcal{I}_T)} + \|f\|_{L_2(\mathcal{Q}_T)}\right) \tag{5.14}$$

for some constant $C(T)$.

Proof. The main idea of proof is to decompose the problem on graph $\mathcal{G}$ into n problems on edges, for which such estimate is a well-known result.

Let u be a solution of (5.9)–(5.13) belonging to $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{Q}_T)$. We will denote by σ the restriction of u to the set $\{a\}\times\mathcal{I}_T$. Then for each edge $e \in \mathcal{E}$ the restriction u_e is a solution to the problem

$$\partial_t^2 u_e - b_e\partial_\xi^2 u_e + q_e u_e = f_e \quad \text{in } (0,\ell_j)\times\mathcal{I}_T, \tag{5.15}$$

$$u_e(\xi,0) = \varphi_e(\xi), \quad \partial_t u_e(\xi,0) = \psi_e(\xi), \quad \xi \in (0,\ell_j), \tag{5.16}$$

$$u_e(0,t) = \sigma(t), \quad u_e(\ell_j,t) = 0 \quad t \in \mathcal{I}_T, \tag{5.17}$$

where e connects the vertices a and a_j, and ξ is a point of the interval $(0,\ell_j)$. It should be stressed that σ is the same function for all edges $e \in \mathcal{E}$, which is a consequence of continuity condition (5.12).

At the same time, the function σ is a solution of the integral equation

$$\sigma(t) - \int_0^t \mathcal{K}(t,\tau)\sigma(\tau)\,d\tau = F(t) \tag{5.18}$$

in $L^2(\mathcal{I}_T)$ with the continuous kernel $\mathcal{K}$ and right-hand F. This equation can be obtained as follows. Each function u_e has an integral representation entailing the Riemann function and the input data of (5.15)–(5.17). This is possible since the main part of hyperbolic PDE has constant coefficients [35, II.5]. Substituting these representations into the Kirchhoff vertex condition (5.13) yields equation (5.18), see [26] for more details.

Next, for a solution of (5.15)–(5.17) we have the estimate

$$\|u_e\|_{W_2^2(e\times\mathcal{I}_T)} \le C_1(T)\,\Big(\|\varphi\|_{W_2^1(e)} + \|\psi\|_{L_2(e)} + \|\sigma\|_{L_2(\mathcal{I}_T)} + \|f\|_{L_2(e\times\mathcal{I}_T)}\Big), \tag{5.19}$$

where $e \in \mathcal{E}$ [33, IV.4]. On the other hand, the Volterra integral equation of the second kind (5.18) admits a unique solution σ such that

$$\|\sigma\|_{L_2(\mathcal{I}_T)} \le C_2(T)\,\Big(\|\varphi\|_{W_2^1(e)} + \|\psi\|_{L_2(e)} + \|\nu\|_{L_2(\mathcal{I}_T)} + \|f\|_{L_2(e\times\mathcal{I}_T)}\Big), \tag{5.20}$$

since the right-hand side F depends on the input data of (5.9)–(5.13). Inequalities (5.19) and (5.20) combined give the estimate (5.14) after summation over $e \in \mathcal{E}$. □

5.3. **Justification of asymptotics.** We now have the desired result.

Theorem 5.2. *Given $T > 0$ suppose that u^ε is a weak solution of problem (2.2)–(2.6) in $\mathcal{Q}_T$. Then u^ε admits the asymptotic expansion of the form*

$$u^\varepsilon(x,t) \sim \begin{cases} U_0(x,t) + \displaystyle\sum_{s=1}^{\infty}\sum_{i=1}^{k} \varepsilon^{sm_i} U_s^{(i)}(x,t) & \text{if } (x,t) \in \mathcal{Q}_0^T, \\ \displaystyle\sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \{b^\varepsilon(x)\}^{\frac{s}{2}} \big(u_s(x,t) + v_s(y_\varepsilon,t) + w_s^\varepsilon(x,t)\big) & \text{if } (x,t) \in \mathcal{Q}_*^T \end{cases}$$

with all coefficients constructed in Sections 3 and 4, namely for any $p = 0, 1, \dots$ the solution u^ε and the approximation $u^{\varepsilon,p}$ given by (5.1) satisfy the inequality

$$\|u^\varepsilon - u^{\varepsilon,p}\|_{W_2^2(\mathcal{Q}_T)} \le C_p(T)\,\varepsilon^{(p+\frac{1}{2})m_1} \tag{5.21}$$

with constant $C_p(T)$, being independent of ε.

Proof. Our proof starts with the observation that the difference $u^{\varepsilon,p} - u^\varepsilon$ solves the problem (5.2)–(5.6) with φ, ψ, μ and f replaced by zero functions. Therefore this difference can be estimated by the corresponding norms of remainder terms $h^{\varepsilon,p}$ and $\nu^{\varepsilon,p}$ using estimate (5.14). But one must be careful with this estimate, because the constant $C(T)$ is inversely proportional to the ellipticity bound of (5.9). In the case of problem (5.2)–(5.6) we have $\min_{x\in\mathcal{G}} b^\varepsilon(x) = \varepsilon^{2m_k}$ for small ε, where $m_k = \max_i\{m_i\}$. Hence,

$$\|u^\varepsilon - u^{\varepsilon,p}\|_{W_2^2(\mathcal{Q}_T)} \le c_1\varepsilon^{-2m_k}\,\big(\|\nu^{\varepsilon,p}\|_{L_2(\mathcal{I}_T)} + \|h^{\varepsilon,p}\|_{L_2(\mathcal{Q}_T)}\big) \le c_2\varepsilon^{(p+1)m_1-2m_k},$$

by (5.7) and (5.8). In order to improve the estimate, we consider the last inequality for bigger number $p + r$. Then

$$\|u^\varepsilon - u^{\varepsilon,p+r}\|_{W_2^2(\mathcal{Q}_T)} \le c_2\varepsilon^{(p+1)m_1+(rm_1-2m_k)} \le c_3\varepsilon^{(p+1)m_1},$$

provided $rm_1 \ge 2m_k$. From this we readily deduce that

$$\|u^\varepsilon - u^{\varepsilon,p}\|_{W_2^2(\mathcal{Q}_T)} - \|u^{\varepsilon,p+r} - u^{\varepsilon,p}\|_{W_2^2(\mathcal{Q}_T)} \le c_3\varepsilon^{(p+1)m_1},$$

and hence that

$$\|u^\varepsilon - u^{\varepsilon,p}\|_{W_2^2(\mathcal{Q}_T)} \le c_3\varepsilon^{(p+1)m_1} + \|u^{\varepsilon,p+r} - u^{\varepsilon,p}\|_{W_2^2(\mathcal{Q}_T)}.$$

It is worth remarking at this stage that the W_2^2 norms of boundary layers $v_s(y_\varepsilon, \cdot\,)$ and w_s^ε are infinite large as $\varepsilon \to 0$. Moreover, the contributions in the norm from the second derivatives on x are the largest. Therefore

$$\|u^{\varepsilon,p+r}-u^{\varepsilon,p}\|_{W_2^2(\mathcal{Q}_T)} \le c_4 \left(\|(b^\varepsilon)^{\frac{p+1}{2}} \partial_x^2 v_{p+1}(y_\varepsilon, \cdot\,)\|_{L^2(\mathcal{Q}_*^T)} + \|(b^\varepsilon)^{\frac{p+1}{2}} \partial_x^2 w_{p+1}^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\mathcal{Q}_*^T)} \right).$$

We will derive an estimate for the first norm in the right hand side of the last inequality. The second one can be bounded similarly. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|(b^\varepsilon)^{\frac{p+1}{2}} \partial_x^2 v_{p+1}(y_\varepsilon, \cdot\,)\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{Q}_*^T)} &= \sum_{i=1}^k \varepsilon^{2m_i(p+1)} \sum_{\gamma\in\mathcal{E}_i} \|\partial_x^2 v_{p+1,\gamma}(y_\varepsilon, \cdot\,)\|^2_{L^2(\gamma\times\mathcal{I}_T)} \\ &\le c_5 \sum_{i=1}^k \varepsilon^{2m_i(p+1)} \varepsilon^{-m_i} \le c_6 \varepsilon^{(2p+1)m_1}, \end{aligned}$$

since

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_x^2 v_{s,\gamma}(y_\varepsilon, \cdot\,)\|^2_{L^2(\gamma\times\mathcal{I}_T)} &= \int_0^T \int_\gamma |\partial_x^2 v_{s,\gamma}(\varepsilon^{-m_i}(x-a_j),t)|^2 \, d\gamma \, dt \\ &= \varepsilon^{-2m_i} \int_0^T \int_0^{\varepsilon^{m_i}} |\partial_y^2 v_{s,\gamma}(\varepsilon^{-m_i}\pi_\gamma(\alpha),t)|^2 \, d\alpha \, dt \\ &= \varepsilon^{-m_i} \int_0^T \int_0^1 |\partial_y^2 v_{s,\gamma}(y,t)|^2 \, dy \, dt \le c_7 \varepsilon^{-m_i} \end{aligned}$$

for any $\gamma \in \mathcal{E}_i$, where $\pi_\gamma \colon [0,\ell_j] \to \gamma$ is the natural parametrization of the edge γ. Here we also used the main property of boundary layer $v_s(y_\varepsilon, \cdot\,)$ be different from zero in the $\sqrt{b^\varepsilon}\,t$-neighbourhood of vertex a only. Hence

$$\|u^{\varepsilon,p+r} - u^{\varepsilon,p}\|_{W_2^2(\mathcal{Q}_T)} \le c_8 \, \varepsilon^{(p+\frac{1}{2})m_1}. \tag{5.22}$$

Combining the previous inequalities now yields (5.21). □

Acknowledgment. The authors would like to thank Ruslan Andrusiak for helpful discussions.

References

1. Kuchment P., *Quantum graphs I: Some basic structures.* Waves Random Media. – 2004. – V.14, no. 1. – P. S107– S128. 1
2. Kronig R. and Penney W., *Quantum mechanics of electron in crystal lattices.* Proc. R. Soc. Lond., Ser. A. – 1931. – V.130. – P.499–513. 1
3. Pauling L., *The diamagnetic anisotropy of aromatic molecules.* J. Chem. Phys. – 1936. – V.4, no. 673. 1
4. Platt J., *Classification of spectra of cata-condensed hydrocarbons.* J. Chem. Phys. – 1949. – V.17, no. 484. 1
5. Flesia C., Johnston R. and Kunz H., *Strong localization of Classical Waves: A numerical study.* Europhys. Lett., V.3, No. 4, 1987, pp. 497 – 502. 1
6. Anderson P., *New method for scaling theory of localization. II. Multichannel theory of a "wire" and possible extension to higher dimensionality.* Phys. Rev. B, V. 23, Issue 10, 1981, pp.4828 – 4836. 1
7. Avishai Y., Luck J., *Quantum percolation and ballistic conductance on a lattice of wires.* Phys. Rev. B, V. 46, Issue 3, 1992, pp.1074 – 1095. 1
8. Kowal D., Sivan U., Entin-Wohlman O. and Imry Y., *Transmission through multiply-connected wire systems.* Phys. Rev. B, V. 42, Issue 14, 1990, pp.9009 – 9018. 1

9. von Below J., *Classical solvability of linear parabolic equations in networks.* J. Differ. Equations. 1988. V. 52. P. 316–337. 1
10. Mehmeti, F. A. and Meister, E., *Regular solutions of transmission and interaction problems for wave equations.* Math. Meth. Appl. Sci. (1989) 11: 665–685. 1, 2
11. Ali-Mehmeti F., Nonlinear waves in networks. Academie-Verlag, 1994. 1, 2
12. Pokornyi Yu., and Borovskikh A., *Differential equations on networks (geometric graphs).* Journal of Mathematical Sciences, Vol. 119, No. 6, 2004, pp.691–718. 1
13. Pokornyi Yu. V., Penkin O. M., Pryadiev V. L., Borovskikh A. V., Lazarev K. P., and Shabrov S. A., Differential equations on geometric graphs. Moskva: Fizmatlit. 2004. 1
14. Dáger R. and Zuazua E., *Spectral boundary controllability of networks of strings,* Comptes Rendus Mathematique, Vol. 334, Is. 7, 2002, pp. 545–550. 1
15. Kostrykin V., Potthoff J., and Schrader R., *Finite propagation speed for solutions of the wave equation on the metric graphs,* J. Funct. Anal. 263 (2012), 1198–1223. 1
16. Banda M. K., Herty M., and Klar A., *Gas Flow in Pipeline Networks.* Networks and Heter. Media, (2006) Vol. 1(1), pp:41–56. 1
17. Mehmeti F. A. and Régnier V., *Splitting of energy of dispersive waves in a star-shaped network,* Z. Angew. Math. Mech. 83 (2003), No. 2, pp. 105–118. 1
18. Mehmeti F. A., Haller-Dintelmannand R., and Régnier V. *Multiple tunnel effect for dispersive waves on a star-shaped network: an explicit formula for the spectral representation,* J. Evol. Equ. 12 (2012), pp. 513–545. 1
19. Golovaty Yu., and Hrabchak H., *Asymptotics of spectrum of Sturm-Liouville operator on networks with perturbed density.* Visnyk. Lviv Univ. Ser. Mech-Math. 2007. Vol. 67. P. 66-83. 1
20. Golovaty Yu., and Hrabchak H., *On Sturm-Liouville problem on starlike graphs with "heavy" nodes.* Visnyk Lviv Univ., Ser. Mech-Math., 2010, V. 72, p. 63–78. 1
21. Golovaty Yu., and Hryniv R., *Norm resolvent convergence of singularly scaled Schrödinger operators and δ'-potentials.* Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh: Section A Mathematics, (2013) 143, 791–816. 1
22. Golovaty Yu., *1D Schrödinger operators with short range interactions: two-scale regularization of distributional potentials.* Integral Equations and Operator Theory (2013) V.75, Is.3, 341–362. 1
23. Man'ko S. S. *On δ'-like potential scattering on star graphs.* J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. – 2010. – V. 43, 44. – ID 445304, 14 p. 1
24. Manko S., *Schrödinger operators on star graphs with singularly scaled potentials supported near the vertices.* J. Math. Phys. 53, No. 12, 123521, 13 p. (2012). 1
25. Exner P., and Manko S. *Approximations of quantum-graph vertex couplings by singularly scaled potentials.* J. Phys. A, Math. Theor. 46, No. 34, 17 p. (2013). 1
26. Flyud V., and Golovaty Yu., *Singular perturbed boundary value problem for hyperbolic equation on geometric graph.* Manufacturing Processes. Some Problems. Volume 1. Basic science applications in manufacturing processes. University of Technology, Opole, 2012, p.145–166. 1, 3.4, 5.2
27. Vishik M. I. and Lyusternik L. A., *Regular degeneration and boundary layer for linear differential equations with small parameter.* Uspekhi Matematicheskikh Nauk (1957) **12**(5), 3–122. 1
28. Vasil'eva, A. B., and Butuzov V. F., Asymptotic expansions of solutions of singularly perturbed equations. Nauka, Moscow, 1973. 1
29. Trenogin V. A., *The development and applications of the asymptotic method of Lyusternik and Vishik.* Russian Mathematical Surveys (1970), **25**(4), 119–156. 1
30. Krzyżański M., Schauder J. *Quasilineare Differentialgleichungen zweiter Ordnung vom hyperbolischen Typus. Gemischte Randwertaufgaben.* Studia Mathematica, 1936, 6.1: 162-189. 2
31. Sakamoto R. *Mixed problems for hyperbolic equations I Energy inequalities.* Journal of Mathematics of Kyoto University, 1970, 10.2: 349-373. 2, 4
32. Sakamoto R. *Mixed problems for hyperbolic equations II, Existence Theorem with Zero Initial Data and Energy Inequalities with Initial Datas.* Journal of Mathematics of Kyoto University, 1970, 10.3: 403-417. 2, 4
33. Ladyzhenskaya O. A. The boundary value problems of Mathematical Physics. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1985. (Appl.Math.Sci. V.49) 2, 5.2

34. Volevich S. G., Gindikin L. R. Mixed problem for partial differential equations with quasihomogeneous principal part. American Mathematical Soc., 1996. 2
35. Tikhonov A. N., and Samarskii A. A., Equations of Mathematical Physics. Vol. 39. Courier Dover Publications, 1990. 3.2, 5.2

[1] Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, Lviv, Ukraine
[2] Opole University of Technology, Opole, Poland and Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, Lviv, Ukraine
E-mail address: yu_holovaty@franko.lviv.ua, flyud@yahoo.com